

### REMARKS

At the time of this response, Claim 4 has been amended and claims 1-21 are pending.

Claims 4-7 are rejected for indefiniteness based on use of the term “or the like” in claim 4. The term has been removed by amendment. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected for anticipation by US Patent No. 6,157,831 (“Lamb”). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

*Prima facie*, rejection of a claim for anticipation by a reference requires that the reference describe, explicitly or by inherency, all of the elements or steps, and all of the limitations of the rejected claim.

Claim 1 is a method for use “in a mobile gateway”. The claim includes the step of “storing, at the mobility gateway, a plurality of temporary transfer-to telephone numbers ...”. The term “mobility gateway” has a clear and well-understood meaning in the mobile communications arts. In this regard, see the *Ericsson Review* article entitled “Jambala Mobility Gateway-Convergence and inter-system roaming” that is forwarded herewith. The applicants have used the term throughout the specification and claims in a manner that is altogether consistent with its accepted meaning. A diligent reading of Lamb does not reveal any action or function according to which “temporary transfer-to numbers” are stored “at the mobility gateway ...”. Fig. 1 of Lamb shows an SS7 network using an IS-41 protocol. The illustrated system does not include a mobility gateway. Accordingly, Lamb does not anticipate claims 1-3. If the omitted step is considered to be inherent in Lamb, the applicants respectfully request the introduction of extrinsic evidence that the missing step is necessarily present in Lamb, and that it would be recognized as being so by persons of ordinary skill. Otherwise, the applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4-21 have been rejected for obviousness over Lamb. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

*Prima facie*, rejection of a claim for obviousness over a modified reference requires some suggestion to make the proposed modification to the reference, a reasonable expectation of success, and the presence, explicitly or by suggestion, of all elements (or steps) of the rejected claim.

Lamb describes a problem afflicting the implementation of call forwarding bins in a home location register (HLR) in which the omission to activate a particular kind of call forwarding bin might result in the delivery of an erroneous message to the caller of a valid telephone number. See Lamb at Col. 2, line 52-Col. 3, line 10. The problem is presented in the context of a single

network operating according to a single protocol. Lamb does not address the problem of call forwarding for a wireless telephone in the context of two dissimilar systems connected through a mobility gateway. There is no discussion of any call forwarding problem encountered when a wireless phone roams between dissimilar systems. As clearly set forth in the Background section of this application, the problem in this context is that one system in which a roaming wireless phone is operating cannot indicate to another, dissimilar system that the phone, if active, is either busy or unanswered. Accordingly there is no suggestion to modify Lamb to accommodate the provision of a call-forwarding solution for two heterogeneous phone systems connected through a mobility gateway.


Moreover, with respect to claims 4-14 and 19-21, as already stated, Lamb omits any mention of a "mobility gateway". All of these claims are limited by this term. Since Lamb does not consider any call forwarding problem respecting a wireless phone roaming between unlike systems, there is also no suggestion that a mobility gateway is included in Lamb's description. If the omitted mobility gateway is considered to be suggested in Lamb, the applicants respectfully request the introduction of a reference or an affidavit supporting the suggestion of the missing subject matter. Otherwise, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to claims 4-14 and 19-21.

Claims 15-18 concern forwarding a call intended for a subscriber unit when the subscriber unit is roaming. In the claimed method, a call request for the roaming unit is received and stored, and then a location request message is received "from a mobile switching center which homes a temporary transfer-to telephone number associated with the roaming subscriber unit". That "message" is associated with the unit and then a "redirection request message" is sent "to a gateway mobile switching center which received the call request for the roaming subscriber unit". A "temporary transfer-to telephone number" is defined in detail in the specification at page 6, lines 15-28. Briefly, among other attributes, "temporary transfer-to telephone numbers may be dynamically assigned to roaming subscriber units." There are no such numbers disclosed or suggested in Lamb. The contents of a SYSP file 224 illustrated in Lamb's Fig. 7 include area code split logic to translate old numbers to new numbers and a number of prioritized bins, each containing a forward-to number. None of these numbers is homed to a mobile switching center, different from both subscriber number and a forwarding number associated with the subscriber, used as a translation between the subscriber number and the forwarding number, or dynamically assignable to a roaming subscriber unit. These and more attributes, and other equivalent characteristics, of a "temporary transfer-to telephone number" are absent from any phone number described in Lamb. Since Lamb does not consider

any gap between a subscriber's phone number and a call forwarding number associated with the subscriber, there is also no suggestion that a temporary transfer-to telephone number associated with the subscriber to fill that gap is included in Lamb's description. If the omitted temporary transfer-to telephone number is considered to be suggested in Lamb, the applicants respectfully request the introduction of a reference or an affidavit supporting the suggestion of the missing subject matter. Otherwise, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to claims 15-18.

No fee is deemed necessary with the filing of this paper. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2258. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted



TERRANCE A. MEADOR  
Reg. No. 30, 298

Date: *15 May 2002*

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH  
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100  
San Diego, CA 92121-2133

Telephone: (858) 638-6747 Fax: (858) 638-6727

**VERSION WITH MARKING SHOWING CHANGES MADE**

**IN THE CLAIMS**

4. (Amended) The method according to claim 3, further comprising:  
after selecting and sending, receiving and storing information related to a call request for the roaming subscriber unit; and  
after receiving and storing, receiving a location request message [or the like] from a mobile switching center which homes the temporary transfer-to telephone number.